

STATE OF ILLINOIS

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

ILLINOIS BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY :

Petitioner :

v. :

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY :

Respondent :

Docket No. 01-0078

Complaint regarding wrongful refusal to  
provide customer-specific customer transition  
charges pursuant to Section 10-108 of the  
Public Utility Act

Direct Testimony of

John Leick

Principal Rate Administrator  
Distribution Pricing Department

Commonwealth Edison Company

PUBLIC VERSION

**OFFICIAL FILE**

I.C.C. DOCKET NO. 01-0078

ComEd

Exhibit No. 2.0

Witness Leick

Date 5/16/02

Reporter OK

1   **Q.    Please state your name and business address.**

2   A.    My name is John Leick. My business address is ComEd Delivery Operations Center,  
3        Distribution Pricing, Third Floor, Three Lincoln Center, Oak Brook Terrace, Illinois  
4        60181-4260.

5   **Q.    By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

6   A.    I am employed by Commonwealth Edison Company as a Principal Rate Administrator in  
7        the Distribution Pricing Department.

8   **Q.    Please describe your responsibilities as Principal Rate Administrator?**

9   A.    My responsibilities include the coordination, formulation, evaluation, development,  
10        preparation, and review of cost studies and analyses related to pricing of electric services,  
11        including the evaluation of how tariff or rate changes may impact ComEd customers. In  
12        my job, I am responsible for calculating customer-specific Customer Transition Charges  
13        (CTCs) when applicable. In addition, my responsibilities include the development and  
14        recommendation of new tariffs and revision to existing tariffs relating to retail electric  
15        services.

16   **Q.    When did you assume those responsibilities?**

17  
18   A.    December 1998.

19  
20   **Q.    Please describe your background and experience prior to serving as Principal Rate**  
21        **Administrator.**

22   A.    I hold a Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from Iowa State  
23        University. I also hold a Master of Business Administration from North Central College.  
24        I have been employed by ComEd since June 1990. I began my career as an Energy  
25        Engineer. I then held several positions in customer services. As an Account Manager, I

1 served as the primary customer contact for large usage customers in the Property  
2 Management Segment of the Energy Services Organization (ESO). In that role, I was  
3 also responsible for analyzing electric power and energy usage and trends for retail  
4 service. I next served as a Customer Facilities Engineer. In that position, I had  
5 responsibility for designing and preparing construction work orders in response to  
6 requests for new and revised electric service for commercial and industrial customers;  
7 preparing cost estimates; and ordering equipment necessary to provide the requested  
8 service for those customers. In 1998, I transitioned to my current position in the  
9 Distribution Pricing Department. When performing all these jobs, I interpreted and  
10 applied ComEd's rates, riders, and service policies on a daily basis.

11 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

12  
13 A. My testimony quantifies the net financial effect on Ameritech if Com  
14 Ed had billed the Ameritech locations served under the Electric Service Contract dated  
15 July 8, 1997 (the "Contract") under Rate RCDS – Retail Customer Delivery Service  
16 ("Rate RCDS"), Rider PPO – Power Purchase Option ("Rider PPO") beginning in  
17 December 1999 using customer-specific Customer Transition Charges ("CTC") that I  
18 calculated for each Ameritech location on a customer-specific basis. I then performed  
19 various calculations to determine the net financial effect on Ameritech's accounts  
20 assuming that Ameritech had elected to terminate its Contract with ComEd in December  
21 1999 and instead had received service from ComEd under the provisions of Rate RCDS  
22 and Rider PPO with the hypothetical customer-specific CTC. I explain those  
23 calculations in this testimony.

24 **Q. Please provide a summary of your testimony.**

1  
2 A. As I understand Mr. Ragland's testimony, Ameritech claims that it would be entitled to a  
3 refund of approximately \$2.2 million if ComEd performed customer-specific CTC  
4 calculations for all the locations served under the Contract and re-billed Ameritech under  
5 Rate RCDS and Rider PPO beginning in December 1999. While ComEd does not  
6 believe that Ameritech is entitled to such customer-specific CTCs for the reasons  
7 identified in David Geraghty's testimony, I calculated CTCs for Ameritech on a  
8 customer-specific basis to quantify the financial amount at issue in this proceeding.  
9 Even assuming that Ameritech was entitled to customer-specific CTCs for all locations  
10 served under the Contract, Ameritech's claim of \$2.2 million in "damages" is  
11 significantly overstated.. My calculations show that, at best, Ameritech could claim that  
12 it would have saved \$251,867 from December 1999 to December 2001 as compared to  
13 the charges under the applicable bundled service tariff rate(s) if ComEd had provided  
14 service to Ameritech under Rate RCDS and Rider PPO with a customer-specific CTC for  
15 the 51 locations served under the Contract. Moreover, this approximately \$252,000 in  
16 "savings" does not include \$ 847,520 that would have to be repaid to ComEd per the  
17 Contract terms. Thus, in the final analysis if ComEd re-billed Ameritech as described  
18 above, Ameritech would actually owe money to ComEd if ComEd re-billed Ameritech  
19 and certainly would not be entitled to the \$2.2 million refund it requests.

20 **Q. Please describe generally the calculations you performed related to this case.**

21  
22 A. As I mentioned, I have calculated the hypothetical customer-specific CTCs for each  
23 Ameritech location served under the Contract. Ameritech first requested a customer-  
24 specific CTC in November 1999. I therefore compiled billing data for the locations

1 recognized and served under the Contract in 1999. As detailed in Bill Voller's  
2 testimony, there originally were 22 locations recognized and served by the Contract. In  
3 1999, Ameritech had 51 locations recognized and served under the Contract. I analyzed  
4 the available ComEd billing data for these 51 locations in order to perform my  
5 calculations. As I understand Ameritech's complaint, it claims that 136 locations were  
6 recognized and served under the Contract. While ComEd disputes that 136 locations  
7 were ever recognized and served under the Contract, I performed the same analysis using  
8 available data relating to the 136 locations identified by Ameritech in its complaint.

9  
10 I then used Ameritech's actual electric demand and energy usage to calculate the cost  
11 difference between the actual rate billed to Ameritech and the hypothetical "alternative"  
12 rate Ameritech would have been billed if it had in fact terminated its Contract with  
13 ComEd in 1999 and elected to be served under Rate RCDS and Rider PPO with a  
14 hypothetical customer-specific CTC for each location for the period of December 1999  
15 through December 2001. During that two-year period however, changes occurred in the  
16 applicable charges used in CTC calculations changed. The events which triggered those  
17 changes can be grouped into five periods:

- 18 • **Period 1** - Market Value Energy Charges were determined pursuant to the original  
19 Rider PPO, Power Purchase Option Neutral Fact Finder (Rider PPO -  
20 NFF) until March 21, 2000.
- 21  
22 • **Period 2** - On March 21, 2000 the Rider PPO - NFF charges were changed along  
23 with the charges in Rate RCDS.
- 24  
25 • **Period 3** - Starting with the June monthly billing period in 2000 Rider PPO, ComEd  
26 customers served on Rider PPO-NFF could, at their option, could elect to  
27 switch to Power Purchase Option Market Index (Rider PPO - MI)  
28 Applicable Period A.

1  
2       ● **Period 4** - Those customers served on Rider PPO-NFF elected not to switch to the  
3       Rider PPO – MI in June 2000 as described in Period 3, the customer  
4       would have been automatically switched from Rider PPO – NFF charges  
5       to Rider PPO – MI Applicable Period B pricing beginning with their  
6       January 2001 monthly billing period.

7  
8       ● **Period 5** - Starting with the June monthly billing period in 2001, Rider PPO – MI had  
9       new Applicable Period A pricing changed.

10  
11       I performed my calculations for each of the five periods that I described above. In  
12       addition, I performed calculations for the 51 locations served under the Contract during  
13       1999, and then performed the same calculations assuming that 136 locations were served  
14       under the Contract as Ameritech alleges.

15  
16       Having completed these calculations, I prepared Exhibits 1 and 2 to my testimony. These  
17       Exhibits each include three tables displaying the cost difference to Ameritech between  
18       the applicable bundled rate that Ameritech was billed as compared to the estimated  
19       amounts that would have been hypothetically billed if Ameritech had terminated its  
20       contract with ComEd and elected to receive services from ComEd under Rate RCDS,  
21       Rider PPO, and Rate CTC beginning in December 1999.

22   **Q.   Please explain the difference between Exhibits 1 and 2 to your testimony.**

23   **A.   In early 2000, ComEd customers served under Rider PPO had a choice to continue to be**  
24       served under Rider PPO-NFF or switch to Rider PPO – MI for the remainder of the 2000  
25       calendar year. Some ComEd customers served under Rider PPO-NFF elected to switch  
26       to Rider PPO-Market Index beginning with the June 2000 billing period, while others  
27       continued under Rider PPO – NFF throughout the 2000 monthly period periods.  
28       However, all Rider PPO customers were switched to Rider PPO – Market Index

1 beginning with the January 2001 billing period. Exhibit 1 to my testimony assumes that  
2 Ameritech would have elected to switch to Rider PPO- Market Index beginning with the  
3 June 2000 billing period. Exhibit 2 assumes that Ameritech would have elected to  
4 remain on Rider PPO – NFF throughout the 2000 calendar year and would have switched  
5 to Rider PPO – Market Index in January 2001.

6 **Q. On Exhibits 1 and 2, you have three different groupings of Ameritech locations.**  
7 **Would you please explain why there are three different groups of locations on those**  
8 **Exhibits?**

9 A. As I mentioned, the Ameritech Contract listed only 22 locations. Group 1 on both  
10 Exhibits provides the summary of my calculations related to those 22 locations only.  
11 By 1999 however, Ameritech had added several locations to the Contract and therefore  
12 51 locations were recognized and served under the Contract as mentioned in William  
13 Voller's testimony. Group 2 of both Exhibits therefore provides the summary of my  
14 calculations using available data from those 51 locations. In its original complaint,  
15 Ameritech listed 136 locations that it claimed were recognized and served under the  
16 Contract. While Mr. Ragland's testimony on Ameritech's behalf lists only 126 locations,  
17 I performed calculations using all 136 locations that Ameritech originally listed in its  
18 complaint. Group 3 therefore provides the summary of my calculations using available  
19 ComEd billing data for those 136 locations.

20 **Q. Examining Exhibits 1 and 2, Ameritech had 51 locations served under the Contract,**  
21 **yet your Group 2 analysis only includes 49 locations. Would you explain why your**  
22 **Group 2 analysis includes only 49 locations?**

1 A. I excluded Ameritech's facility at 2000 Ameritech Drive in Hoffman Estates, Illinois  
2 (account #2162031005) because that location was entitled to a customer- specific CTC  
3 as a result of the demand having exceeded the 3 megawatt threshold for customer-  
4 specific CTCs as defined in Rate CTC. I also excluded the account serving 15975 W.  
5 Highway 22 in Lincolnshire, Illinois because no data could be located for this address.

6 **Q. Examining Group 3 on Exhibits 1 and 2, you stated that Ameritech lists 136**  
7 **locations in its complaint, yet Group 3 only includes 129 locations. Would you**  
8 **explain why your Group 3 analysis includes only 129 locations?**

9 A. I excluded the same 2 Ameritech locations I previously identified, and excluded 5  
10 additional Ameritech locations because they either were billed in lieu of demand. or had  
11 bills with zero energy usage.



1  
2 **Q. How does the exclusion of these accounts affect your analysis?**

3 A. There is no significant impact to my analysis. Regarding 2000 Ameritech Drive,  
4 Ameritech was entitled to a customer-specific CTC for this location given its historical  
5 demand usage. Therefore, ComEd provided Ameritech a customer-specific CTC for this  
6 particular location and it cannot be part of this complaint. Based on my experience and  
7 review of Ameritech's usage at its locations that are at issue in this proceeding, I would  
8 expect that the calculations for any one of these remaining locations would be in line with  
9 my calculations for the other Ameritech locations listed in Exhibit 12 to my testimony.

10 **Q. Based on your experience, which of these three groups would be used to calculate**  
11 **the customer-specific CTCs if Ameritech had been entitled to such CTCs?**

12 A. While ComEd does not believe that Ameritech is entitled to such customer-specific  
13 CTCs, ComEd would have used Group 2 (51 accounts) if ComEd would have had to  
14 calculate customer-specific CTCs for Ameritech. As I understand Ameritech's claims,  
15 Ameritech would have elected to operate under Rate RCDS and Rider PPO in December  
16 1999 if it had been provided with a customer-specific CTC at that time. To do so,  
17 Ameritech would have had to terminate its existing Contract with ComEd and ComEd  
18 would have performed the customer-specific CTC calculations using the accounts  
19 recognized and served under the Contract during the 1999 curtailment season -- the 51  
20 accounts attached to William Voller's testimony.

21 **Q. Do your calculations rely on any assumptions?**

22 A. Yes. As Ameritech did not in fact terminate its Contract with ComEd in November 1999  
23 and elect to operate under Rate RCDS and Rider PPO, there is no actual billing data for

1 this "alternative" rate calculation. As a consequence, I had to rely on existing data and  
2 made certain assumptions based on this data and my experience at ComEd. I have  
3 detailed my methodology, including my assumptions, in Exhibit 3 to my testimony.

4 **Q. Would you explain how you obtained the amounts representing the cost difference**  
5 **between the bundled rates charged to Ameritech and the rates charged with the**  
6 **hypothetical CTCs shown in Exhibits 1 and 2 to your testimony?**

7 **A.** I will explain in detail my calculation with respect to one Ameritech account or location  
8 as an example. Similar calculations were completed for all the locations served under the  
9 Contract in 1999. While ComEd does not believe that the 136 locations listed in  
10 Ameritech's complaint are appropriately the subject of this proceeding, I also conducted  
11 similar calculations for those additional locations.

12  
13 As an example, I will use account 0935311005 serving 641 N. Dearborn in Chicago,  
14 Illinois. I began my analysis by downloading from ComEd's billing systems the available  
15 billing data for this location. In this case, I was able to retrieve 25 bills covering the  
16 period between November 3, 1999 through December 12, 2001.

17  
18 In calculating customer-specific CTCs, ComEd would typically examine billing data  
19 from July 1996 through June 1999. In this case, I was unable to use such billing data  
20 because it was not readily available in ComEd's current billing systems as I explained in  
21 Exhibit 3 to my testimony. I therefore relied upon billing data for the calendar year 2000,  
22 or in some cases billing data from early 2001 as necessary to obtain a representative  
23 sample. Using this alternative data has a minimal impact on my CTC calculations as in

1 my experience most ComEd customers' individual electrical load profiles do not change  
2 significantly from one year to the next. Ameritech's electrical usage is consistent with  
3 this general principle. An examination of Ameritech's energy usage for a two-year  
4 period (1999-2001) demonstrates that its locations did not experience significant  
5 increases or decreases in their electrical load profiles at the locations under the Contract.  
6 Thus, Ameritech's electrical load profile from the 1996-1999 period would be similar to  
7 its load profile at that location during 2000.

8  
9 I then used this data to calculate a hypothetical customer-specific CTC using the formula  
10 specified in ComEd's Rate CTC – Customer Transition Charge tariff at Ill. C.C. No. 4,  
11 Original Sheet No. 137. Exhibits 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 provide the detailed work papers for  
12 the hypothetical CTC calculations for the various time periods I previously mentioned.  
13 Exhibit 9 to my testimony provides a summary of the various inputs that I used in the  
14 formula for the hypothetical CTC calculation with respect to the 641 N. Dearborn  
15 location. I completed a similar calculation for each Ameritech location recognized under  
16 the Contract. The other Ameritech locations had a similar amount of billing data  
17 available from the 2000 and 2001 time period for my analysis.

18 **Q. Once you calculated the hypothetical customer-specific CTC for Ameritech, please**  
19 **explain how you used these CTCs to calculate the net financial effect to Ameritech if**  
20 **it had elected to be served under Rate RCDS and Rider PPO beginning in December**  
21 **1999.**

22 **A.** Assuming that Ameritech had elected Rate RCDS and Rider PPO, I calculated an  
23 estimate bill representing the charges for service under these tariffs from December 1999-

1        2001. In these calculations, I applied the hypothetical CTC for each location to the  
2        corresponding Rate RCDS charges and Rider PPO – Market Value Energy Charges  
3        (MVECs) in effect at the relevant time. . I then compared the estimated December 1999-  
4        December 2001 charges to the actual charges under the applicable bundled rate for the  
5        December 1999-December 2001 period. To obtain the charges under the applicable  
6        bundled rate, I extracted this data from a billing system query program that calculates a  
7        customer's bill using the applicable tariff rate for each monthly bill received by the  
8        customer designated by the query. My calculations include only base rates. Taxes and  
9        optional facilities rentals are excluded from my calculations. Exhibit 10 to my testimony  
10       displays the total amount of charges for each component of the hypothetical Rate  
11       RCDS/Rider PPO calculations under the two possible billing options for Rider PPO that  
12       were available to ComEd's customers.. Exhibit 11 to my testimony compares the  
13       estimated bill amounts under Rate RCDS and Rider PPO to the applicable bundled rate(s)  
14       for Ameritech.

15    **Q.    What was the result of your calculations regarding 641 North Dearborn?**

16    A.    This particular account would have experienced a savings from the applicable bundled  
17       service tariff rate. However, this does not consider that Ameritech would have had to  
18       repay to ComEd the curtailment payments it received under the Contract.

19    **Q.    Would all the Ameritech locations have experienced a savings from the bundled**  
20       **tariff rate?**

21    A.    No. Many of the Ameritech accounts would not have experienced any savings from the  
22       applicable bundled service tariff rate. As the calculations vary by location, I have

1 attached a summary of the results of my calculations by Ameritech location as Exhibit 12  
2 to my testimony.

3 **Q. As part of your calculations, have you analyzed the net financial impact if in fact**  
4 **Ameritech had terminated its contract with ComEd in December 1999 and switched**  
5 **the 51 locations to Rate RCDs and Rider PPO with customer-specific CTCs?**

6 A. Yes, I have.

7  
8 **Q. What does your analysis show as the net financial effect on Ameritech?**

9  
10 A. First I will outline the results most favorable to Ameritech. Exhibit 2 to my testimony  
11 analyzes if Ameritech had not elected Rider PPO – Market Index in June 2000. If you  
12 examine Group 2 on Exhibit 2 to my testimony, you can see that if Ameritech had elected  
13 Rate RCDS and Rider PPO instead of the applicable bundled service tariff rate,  
14 Ameritech would have saved approximately \$ 251,867 with the application of the  
15 hypothetical customer-specific CTC. This does not end my analysis however. As  
16 Ameritech would have had to terminate its Contract, it would have had to pay back to  
17 ComEd a portion of the curtailment payments it had received under the Contract. The  
18 repayment requirements under the Contract are identical to those in ComEd's Rider 32  
19 tariff. As specified in ComEd's tariff, 30% of the curtailment payments must be repaid if  
20 termination occurs after the 1<sup>st</sup> and before the 2<sup>nd</sup> curtailment season. Forty percent of the  
21 curtailment payments must be repaid if termination occurs after the 2<sup>nd</sup> and before the 3<sup>rd</sup>  
22 curtailment season. Ameritech and ComEd entered into the Contract in July 1997 so  
23 December 1999 would have been the period after the 2<sup>nd</sup> curtailment season and before  
24 the third one. If Ameritech had terminated its Contract in December 1999, Ameritech  
25 would therefore have had to repay to ComEd 40% of any curtailment payments it had

1 received. Ameritech received \$358,558 in payments for curtailment during the 1998  
2 season and \$304,394.74 for curtailment during the 1999 season. Forty percent of these  
3 payments would have totaled \$265,182. In sum, the amount Ameritech would have had  
4 to pay in termination penalties exceeds any savings Ameritech would have received  
5 through December 2001 from customer-specific CTC calculations  
6

7 In addition, ComEd paid Ameritech for curtailment during the 2000 and 2001 curtailment  
8 seasons. Specifically, ComEd paid Ameritech \$318,635.72 for curtailment in 2000 and  
9 \$263,701.99 for curtailment 2001. As these payments would never have been made if  
10 Ameritech had terminated the contract in December 1999, Ameritech should be required  
11 to pay these amounts back to ComEd. In sum, Ameritech would be required to pay  
12 ComEd for the curtailment season payments: \$265,182 (the termination amount for the  
13 1998/1999 curtailment season payments) plus \$318,635.72 (the 2000 curtailment season  
14 payment), plus \$263,701.99 (the 2001 curtailment season payment), for a total of  
15 \$847,520 . By electing Rate RCDS even with a customer-specific CTC, Ameritech at  
16 best would have saved \$251,867 through 2001. However, it would have owed ComEd,  
17 \$847,520. As you can see, Ameritech's election of Rate RCDS, even with use of  
18 customer-specific CTCs, would have resulted in a net loss of \$595,653 for Ameritech.

19 **Q. What does your analysis show if Ameritech had elected to switch to Rider PPO – MI**  
20 **in June 2000 for the 51 locations served under the Contract?**

21 **A.** I have summarized this analysis on Exhibit 1 to my testimony. This would have been  
22 even less favorable for Ameritech. The savings over the applicable bundled service tariff  
23 rate would have amounted to only \$133,808 for the period through December 2001.

1 Ameritech would have had to pay back to ComEd the curtailment payments received  
2 under the Contract that I previously mentioned. In this scenario, Ameritech's election of  
3 Rate RCDS and Rider PPO, even with use of customer-specific CTCs, would have  
4 resulted in a net loss of \$713,712 to Ameritech.

5 **Q. Did you complete the same analysis for the 136 locations listed in Ameritech's**  
6 **complaint?**

7 A. Yes, I did.

8 **Q. What was the net financial effect on Ameritech?**

9 A. As an initial matter, ComEd does not believe that any more than 51 locations are  
10 recognized and served under the Contract. But even assuming the relevant number of  
11 locations under the Contract to be 136, the "savings" from the applicable bundled service  
12 rate for Ameritech is significantly less than the amount claimed by Ameritech in the  
13 complaint. Again looking only at costs, Exhibit 2 shows that it would have cost  
14 Ameritech \$603,558 less for electric service if it had elected service from December  
15 1999-December 2001 under Rate RCDS and Rider PPO with a customer-specific CTC.  
16 If Ameritech had elected to switch to Rider PPO – MI in June 2000, Exhibit 1 shows that  
17 it would have cost Ameritech \$310,511 less than the applicable bundled service rate. It  
18 also must be noted that this figure does not include them more than \$847,520 in  
19 curtailment payments that Ameritech would be required to pay to ComEd under the terms  
20 of the Contract. Thus, even in this scenario, Ameritech would have suffered a \$243,962  
21 net loss if it had terminated the Contract and instead received service under Rate RCDS  
22 and Rider PPO with a customer-specific CTC. If Ameritech had elected Rider-PPO-MI  
23 in June 2000, Ameritech would have experienced a net loss of \$537,009.

1           **Q.    Does this conclude your testimony?**

2           **A.    Yes, it does.**

3

4

5

6

7

8

9





**Exhibit 1****Commonwealth Edison Company**

April 5, 2002

**Estimate of Cost Difference for Electric Service Provided to Ameritech Locations Under the Actual Bundled Service Rate Received by Ameritech versus Electric Service under Rate RCDS, Rider PPO and a Hypothetical Customer-Specific CTC.****Using Period A MI Starting in June 2000\*\*****Group 1 - Cost Difference with the 22 Accounts Listed in the Original Contract.**

Bundled Rate	Estimated Savings to Ameritech Under RCDS/PPO with a Hypothetical Customer Specific CTC (\$)
Rate 6T or 6L	253,019
Rate 6	( 87,608)
Rate 6T Rider 25	13,247
Rate 6 Rider 25	
Totals	\$ 178,657

**Group 2 - Cost Difference with 51 Locations Credited Under the Rider 32 Contract in 1999 (excluding data from 2 locations)\*\***

Bundled Rate	Estimated Savings to Ameritech under RCDS/PPO with a Hypothetical Customer Specific CTC (\$)
Rate 6T or 6L	325,364
Rate 6	(188,449)
Rate 6T Rider 25	15,214
Rate 6 Rider 25	(18,322)
Totals	\$ 133,808

**Group 3 - Cost Difference with 136 Locations Listed in the Ameritech's Complaint (excluding data from 7 locations)\*\***

Bundled Rate	Estimated Savings to Ameritech under RCDS/PPO with a Customer Specific CTC (\$)
Rate 6T or 6L	755,710
Rate 6	(423,529)
Rate 6T Rider 25	17,013
Rate 6 Rider 25	(38,684)
Totals	\$ 310,511

\*\* Methodology, including Assumptions, detailed in Exhibit 3 to testimony.



**Exhibit 2**

Commonwealth Edison Company

April 5, 2002

**Estimate of Cost Difference for Electric Service Provided to Ameritech Locations Under the Actual Bundled Rate Received by Ameritech versus Electric Service under Rate RCDS, Rider PPO and a Hypothetical Customer-Specific CTC.****Using the NFF through year 2000 and Period B MI in Jan 2001\*\*****Group 1 - Cost Difference with the 22 Accounts Listed in the Original Contract**

Bundled Rate	Estimated Savings to Ameritech under RCDS/PPO with a Hypothetical Customer Specific CTC (\$)
Rate 6T or 6L	202,703
Rate 6	(16,938)
Rate 6T Rider 25	18,677
Rate 6 Rider 25	
Totals	\$ 204,442

**Group 2 - Cost Difference with the 51 Locations Credited Under the Rider 32 Contract in 1999 (excluding data from 2 locations)\*\***

Bundled Rate	Estimated Savings to Ameritech under RCDS/PPO with a Hypothetical Customer Specific CTC (\$)
Rate 6T or 6L	261,987
Rate 6	(30,530)
Rate 6T Rider 25	26,774
Rate 6 Rider 25	(6,364)
Totals	\$ 251,867

**Group 3 - Cost Difference with 136 Locations Listed in the Complaint (excluding data from 7 locations)\*\***

Bundled Rate	Estimated Savings to Ameritech under RCDS/PPO with a Hypothetical Customer Specific CTC (\$)
Rate 6T or 6L	637,900
Rate 6	(53,928)
Rate 6T Rider 25	29,659
Rate 6 Rider 25	(10,073)
Totals	\$ 603,558

**\*\* Methodology, including Assumptions, detailed in Exhibit 3 to testimony.**



## **Exhibit 3**

### **Commonwealth Edison Company**

#### **Methodology & Assumptions Used in Calculating the Total Savings or (Loss) for Select Ameritech Accounts Assuming the Accounts were Billed under Rate RCDS, Rider PPO, with a Hypothetical Customer-specific CTC vs. the Actual Rate(s) Applied.**

1. The calculations were performed with available billing data from the December 1999 to December 2001 billing periods.
2. The hypothetical Customer-specific CTCs were calculated using available 12 months of billing data from the year 2000 and/or 2001 if necessary to provide a representative sample. The billing data from 1996 to 1999 that would otherwise be used for such calculations is not readily available in ComEd's billing system. Usage for the 1996-1999 period was assumed to be similar to 2000 usage for individual Ameritech locations.
3. For those locations where Ameritech switched to Rate RCDS, ComEd provided Ameritech with a class CTC. Therefore, calculations of savings or loss to Ameritech included only the difference if any, between the class CTC actually applied and the hypothetical customer-specific CTC.
4. Approximations were used to estimate on-peak and off-peak kWhs for electric space heating usage for Ameritech accounts billed under Time of Use provisions of the applicable rate and under Rider 25 (Electric Space Heating).
5. Locations that qualify for a customer-specific CTC because demand exceeded the 3 MWs threshold for customer-specific CTC as defined in Rate CTC were not included in the calculations.
6. The estimated amounts shown do not include taxes or additional charges.
7. No Rider 32 credits or charges are considered in any of the CTC calculations.
8. Accounts or billing months for which In-Lieu of Demand billing was applied or in which the majority of the energy usage is zero were excluded from the calculations.



**EXHIBIT 4**  
**CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY**





**EXHIBIT 5**  
**CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY**



**EXHIBIT 6**  
**CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY**



**EXHIBIT 7**  
**CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY**



**EXHIBIT 8**  
**CONFIDENTIAL & PROPRIETARY**





# ICC DOCKET NO. 01-0078

## EXHIBIT 9

Hypothetical Customer-specific CTC Components for Account  
#0935311005 (641 N Dearborn, Chicago IL)

Data From Exhibit	Time Period	BR value (cents/kWh)	DS value (cents/kWh)	MV value (cents/kWh)	M value (cents/kWh)	CTC value (cents/kWh)
4	NFF1 – Dec 1999 billing period through Feb 2000 billing period as defined in testimony as Period 1.	5.620	0.901	3.112	0.500	1.107
5	NFF2 - Mar 2000 billing period through May 2000 billing period or through Dec 2000 billing period as defined in the testimony as Period 2.	5.620	0.906	3.112	0.500	1.102
6	Period B 2001 – Jan 2000 billing period through May 2001 billing period or not used at all as defined in the testimony as Period 3.	5.521	0.911	2.738	0.500	1.372
7	Period A 2000 – Jun 2000 billing period through May 2001 billing period as defined in the testimony as Period 4.	5.620	0.906	3.963	0.500	0.251
8	Period A 2001 – Jun 2001 billing period through Dec 2001 billing period as defined in the testimony as Period 5.	5.620	0.906	4.592	0.500	0.000

BR = The average cents/kWh revenue under the applicable bundled base rate charges for the time period analyzed.

DS = The average cents/kWh revenue under the applicable Rate RCDS charges and the Transmission Service Charges for the time period analyzed.

MV = The average cents/kWh revenue using the Market Value Energy Charges from the corresponding Rider PPO for the time period analyzed.

M = The amount of mitigation as defined in Rate CTC – Customer Transition Charge for the time period analyzed.

CTC = The Customer Transition Charge in cents/kWh, rounded to the nearest 0.001 cent, equal to BR – DS – MV – M for the time period analyzed.



**Exhibit 10**

Page 1 of 2

**Sample calculation under Rate RCDS/Rider PPO with a hypothetical customer-specific CTC for account #0935311005 under two options. Option (1) the customer elected to switch to Rider PPO – MI Applicable Period A in June 2000.**

**Option (2) the customer elected to stay on Rider PPO – NFF in June 2000.**

**Option (1) The customer elected to switch to Rider PPO – MI Applicable Period A with the June 2000 billing period.**

Billing Period	Demand (kW)	On Peak Energy (kWh)	Off Peak Energy (kWh)	Customer Charges Under RCDS/PPO	Demand Charge Under Rate RCDS (\$)	Energy Charges Under Rider PPO	Transmission Service Charge	Customer-specific CTC Charge	Total Estimated Delivery Service Bill
Dec-99	582.55	127,995	224,969	\$ 134.45	\$ 2,103.01	\$ 10,371.16	\$ 1,041.26	\$ 3,907.37	\$17,557.25
Jan-00	508.86	133,396	215,318	\$ 134.45	\$ 1,836.98	\$ 10,256.49	\$ 1,028.71	\$ 3,860.29	\$17,116.92
Feb-00	520.64	131,299	217,903	\$ 134.45	\$ 1,879.51	\$ 10,267.49	\$ 1,030.15	\$ 3,865.67	\$17,177.27
Mar-00	518.13	128,903	190,793	\$ 135.05	\$ 1,885.99	\$ 9,412.72	\$ 943.11	\$ 3,523.07	\$15,899.94
Apr-00	621.54	131,082	188,872	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,262.41	\$ 9,423.36	\$ 943.89	\$ 3,525.99	\$16,290.70
May-00	609.76	138,330	192,581	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,219.53	\$ 9,750.13	\$ 976.19	\$ 3,646.64	\$16,727.54
Jun-00	637.49	149,961	250,083	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,320.46	\$ 8,960.47	\$ 1,180.14	\$ 1,004.12	\$13,600.24
Jul-00	615.39	146,713	244,273	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,240.02	\$ 26,745.30	\$ 1,153.41	\$ 981.37	\$31,255.15
Aug-00	680.95	165,219	245,519	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,478.66	\$ 29,305.82	\$ 1,211.68	\$ 1,030.95	\$34,162.16
Sep-00	685.68	173,742	298,327	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,495.88	\$ 31,921.51	\$ 1,392.60	\$ 1,184.89	\$37,129.93
Oct-00	665.73	155,163	230,130	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,423.26	\$ 27,509.88	\$ 1,136.62	\$ 967.09	\$32,171.90
Nov-00	637.93	149,588	214,583	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,322.07	\$ 8,279.33	\$ 1,074.30	\$ 914.07	\$12,724.82
Dec-00	625.51	136,270	248,130	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,276.86	\$ 8,536.80	\$ 1,133.98	\$ 964.84	\$13,047.53
Jan-01	528.37	143,720	256,658	\$ 135.05	\$ 1,923.27	\$ 8,908.36	\$ 1,181.12	\$ 1,004.96	\$13,152.76
Feb-01	523.60	143,471	208,346	\$ 135.05	\$ 1,905.90	\$ 7,988.71	\$ 1,037.86	\$ 883.06	\$11,950.58
Mar-01	535.21	138,308	205,994	\$ 135.05	\$ 1,948.16	\$ 7,798.43	\$ 1,015.69	\$ 864.20	\$11,761.53
Apr-01	532.80	140,325	208,203	\$ 135.05	\$ 1,939.39	\$ 7,897.14	\$ 1,028.16	\$ 874.81	\$11,874.55
May-01	646.72	149,710	247,727	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,354.06	\$ 8,908.87	\$ 1,172.44	\$ 997.57	\$13,567.99
Jun-01	715.36	153,186	235,463	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,603.91	\$ 14,268.11	\$ 1,146.51	\$ 0	\$18,153.58
Jul-01	753.44	166,020	236,328	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,742.52	\$ 25,944.34	\$ 1,186.93	\$ 0	\$30,008.84
Aug-01	740.00	190,549	318,775	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,693.60	\$ 31,198.70	\$ 1,502.51	\$ 0	\$35,529.86
Sep-01	742.08	187,949	296,923	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,701.17	\$ 30,249.68	\$ 1,430.37	\$ 0	\$34,516.27
Oct-01	731.33	171,234	254,470	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,662.04	\$ 27,079.67	\$ 1,255.85	\$ 0	\$31,132.61
Nov-01	734.16	153,231	225,644	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,672.34	\$ 13,981.19	\$ 1,117.69	\$ 0	\$17,906.27
Dec-01	641.76	148,372	269,776	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,336.01	\$ 15,047.74	\$ 1,233.54	\$ 0	\$18,752.34

**Exhibit 10**

Page 2 of 2

Option (2) The customer elected to stay on Rider PPO – NFF in June 2000 and was switched to Rider PPO – MI Applicable Period B with the January 2001 billing period.

Billing Period	Demand (kW)	On Peak Energy (kWh)	Off Peak Energy (kWh)	Customer Charges Under RCDS/PPO	Demand Charge Under Rate RCDS	Energy Charges Under Rider PPO	Transmission Service Charge	Customer-specific CTC Charge	Total Estimated Delivery Service Bill
Dec-99	582.55	127,995	224,969	\$ 134.45	\$ 2,103.01	\$ 10,371.16	\$ 1,041.26	\$ 3,907.37	\$ 17,557.24
Jan-00	508.86	133,396	215,318	\$ 134.45	\$ 1,836.98	\$ 10,256.49	\$ 1,028.71	\$ 3,860.29	\$ 17,116.92
Feb-00	520.64	131,299	217,903	\$ 134.45	\$ 1,879.51	\$ 10,267.49	\$ 1,030.15	\$ 3,865.67	\$ 17,177.26
Mar-00	518.13	128,903	190,793	\$ 135.05	\$ 1,885.99	\$ 9,412.72	\$ 943.11	\$ 3,523.07	\$ 15,899.94
Apr-00	621.54	131,082	188,872	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,262.41	\$ 9,423.36	\$ 943.89	\$ 3,525.99	\$ 16,290.70
May-00	609.76	138,330	192,581	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,219.53	\$ 9,750.13	\$ 976.19	\$ 3,646.64	\$ 16,727.53
Jun-00	637.49	149,961	250,083	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,320.46	\$ 11,761.71	\$ 1,180.14	\$ 4,408.51	\$ 19,805.87
Jul-00	615.39	146,713	244,273	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,240.02	\$ 13,297.32	\$ 1,153.41	\$ 4,308.67	\$ 21,134.47
Aug-00	680.95	165,219	245,519	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,478.66	\$ 14,014.01	\$ 1,211.68	\$ 4,526.33	\$ 22,365.73
Sep-00	685.68	173,742	298,327	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,495.88	\$ 16,041.18	\$ 1,392.60	\$ 5,202.20	\$ 25,266.91
Oct-00	665.73	155,163	230,130	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,423.26	\$ 13,146.58	\$ 1,136.62	\$ 4,245.95	\$ 21,087.46
Nov-00	637.93	149,588	214,583	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,322.07	\$ 10,726.23	\$ 1,074.30	\$ 4,013.16	\$ 18,270.81
Dec-00	625.51	136,270	248,130	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,276.86	\$ 11,290.26	\$ 1,133.98	\$ 4,236.09	\$ 19,072.23
Jan-01	528.37	143,720	256,658	\$ 135.05	\$ 1,923.27	\$ 10,627.69	\$ 1,181.12	\$ 5,493.23	\$ 19,360.36
Feb-01	523.60	143,471	208,346	\$ 135.05	\$ 1,905.90	\$ 9,614.12	\$ 1,037.86	\$ 4,826.93	\$ 17,519.86
Mar-01	535.21	138,308	205,994	\$ 135.05	\$ 1,948.16	\$ 9,375.12	\$ 1,015.69	\$ 4,723.82	\$ 17,197.84
Apr-01	532.80	140,325	208,203	\$ 135.05	\$ 1,939.39	\$ 9,495.31	\$ 1,028.16	\$ 4,781.80	\$ 17,379.71
May-01	646.72	149,710	247,727	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,354.06	\$ 10,662.57	\$ 1,172.44	\$ 5,452.84	\$ 19,776.95
Jun-01	715.36	153,186	235,463	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,603.91	\$ 14,268.11	\$ 1,146.51	\$ 0	\$ 18,153.58
Jul-01	753.44	166,020	236,328	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,742.52	\$ 25,944.34	\$ 1,186.93	\$ 0	\$ 30,008.84
Aug-01	740.00	190,549	318,775	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,693.60	\$ 31,198.70	\$ 1,502.51	\$ 0	\$ 35,529.86
Sep-01	742.08	187,949	296,923	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,701.17	\$ 30,249.68	\$ 1,430.37	\$ 0	\$ 34,516.27
Oct-01	731.33	171,234	254,470	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,662.04	\$ 27,079.67	\$ 1,255.85	\$ 0	\$ 31,132.62
Nov-01	734.16	153,231	225,644	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,672.34	\$ 13,981.19	\$ 1,117.69	\$ 0	\$ 17,906.28
Dec-01	641.76	148,372	269,776	\$ 135.05	\$ 2,336.01	\$ 15,047.74	\$ 1,233.54	\$ 0	\$ 18,752.33



ICC Docket No. 01-0078

**Exhibit 11**

Page 1 of 2

Sample comparison of savings or (loss) under Rate RCDS/Rider PPO with a hypothetical customer-specific CTC vs. the applicable tariff actually applied for account #0935311005 under two options. Option (1) the customer elected to switch to Rider PPO – MI Applicable Period A in June 2000. Option (2) the customer elected to stay on Rider PPO – NFF in June 2000.

Option (1) The customer elected to switch to Rider PPO – MI Applicable Period A with the June 2000 billing period.

Billing Period	Total Bill Under Bundled Services	Total Estimated Delivery Service Bill with a Customer-specific CTC(\$)	Estimated Savings/(Loss) Under Delivery Service
Dec-99	\$ 18,956.85	\$17,557.25	\$ 1,399.60
Jan-00	\$ 18,213.04	\$17,116.92	\$ 1,096.12
Feb-00	\$ 18,287.19	\$17,177.27	\$ 1,109.92
Mar-00	\$ 17,490.53	\$15,899.94	\$ 1,590.59
Apr-00	\$ 18,718.77	\$16,290.70	\$ 2,428.07
May-00	\$ 19,079.98	\$16,727.54	\$ 2,352.44
Jun-00	\$ 21,386.02	\$13,600.24	\$ 7,785.78
Jul-00	\$ 22,735.97	\$31,255.15	\$ (8,519.18)
Aug-00	\$ 24,734.87	\$34,162.16	\$ (9,427.29)
Sep-00	\$ 26,515.66	\$37,129.93	\$ (10,614.27)
Oct-00	\$ 23,594.92	\$32,171.90	\$ (8,576.98)
Nov-00	\$ 20,538.91	\$12,724.82	\$ 7,814.09
Dec-00	\$ 20,440.34	\$13,047.53	\$ 7,392.81
Jan-01	\$ 19,976.04	\$13,152.76	\$ 6,823.28
Feb-01	\$ 18,777.92	\$11,950.58	\$ 6,827.34
Mar-01	\$ 18,563.00	\$11,761.53	\$ 6,801.47
Apr-01	\$ 18,700.82	\$11,874.55	\$ 6,826.27
May-01	\$ 21,419.47	\$13,567.99	\$ 7,851.48
Jun-01	\$ 22,090.96	\$18,153.58	\$ 3,937.38
Jul-01	\$ 25,596.82	\$30,008.84	\$ (4,412.02)
Aug-01	\$ 28,708.89	\$35,529.86	\$ (6,820.97)
Sep-01	\$ 28,081.38	\$34,516.27	\$ (6,434.89)
Oct-01	\$ 25,998.93	\$31,132.61	\$ (5,133.68)
Nov-01	\$ 22,073.01	\$17,906.27	\$ 4,166.74
Dec-01	\$ 21,805.53	\$18,752.34	\$ 3,053.19
TOTAL			\$ 19,317.29

ICC Docket No. 01-0078

Exhibit 11

Page 2 of 2

Option (2) The customer elected to stay on Rider PPO – NFF in June 2000 and was switched to Rider PPO – MI Applicable Period B with the January 2001 billing period.

Billing Period	Total Bill Under Bundled Service	Total Estimated Delivery Service Bill with a Customer Credit (CCL)	Estimated Savings/(Loss) Under Delivery Services
Dec-99	\$ 18,956.85	\$ 17,557.24	\$ 1,399.61
Jan-00	\$ 18,213.04	\$ 17,116.92	\$ 1,096.12
Feb-00	\$ 18,287.19	\$ 17,177.26	\$ 1,109.93
Mar-00	\$ 17,490.53	\$ 15,899.94	\$ 1,590.59
Apr-00	\$ 18,718.77	\$ 16,290.70	\$ 2,428.07
May-00	\$ 19,079.98	\$ 16,727.53	\$ 2,352.45
Jun-00	\$ 21,386.02	\$ 19,805.87	\$ 1,580.15
Jul-00	\$ 22,735.97	\$ 21,134.47	\$ 1,601.50
Aug-00	\$ 24,734.87	\$ 22,365.73	\$ 2,369.14
Sep-00	\$ 26,515.66	\$ 25,266.91	\$ 1,248.75
Oct-00	\$ 23,594.92	\$ 21,087.46	\$ 2,507.46
Nov-00	\$ 20,538.91	\$ 18,270.81	\$ 2,268.10
Dec-00	\$ 20,440.34	\$ 19,072.23	\$ 1,368.11
Jan-01	\$ 19,976.04	\$ 19,360.36	\$ 615.68
Feb-01	\$ 18,777.92	\$ 17,519.86	\$ 1,258.06
Mar-01	\$ 18,563.00	\$ 17,197.84	\$ 1,365.16
Apr-01	\$ 18,700.82	\$ 17,379.71	\$ 1,321.11
May-01	\$ 21,419.47	\$ 19,776.95	\$ 1,642.52
Jun-01	\$ 22,090.96	\$ 18,153.58	\$ 3,937.38
Jul-01	\$ 25,596.82	\$ 30,008.84	\$ (4,412.02)
Aug-01	\$ 28,708.89	\$ 35,529.86	\$ (6,820.97)
Sep-01	\$ 28,081.38	\$ 34,516.27	\$ (6,434.89)
Oct-01	\$ 25,998.93	\$ 31,132.62	\$ (5,133.69)
Nov-01	\$ 22,073.01	\$ 17,906.28	\$ 4,166.73
Dec-01	\$ 21,805.53	\$ 18,752.33	\$ 3,053.20
TOTAL			\$ 17,478.25





**Total Savings or (Loss) for Ameritech Accounts Assuming the Accounts were Billed under Rate RCDS, Rider PPO with a Hypothetical Customer Specific CTC vs. the Actual Applied Rate from December 1999 through December 2001\*\*.**

Account Number	Name	Address	City	Total Savings or (Loss) if the Account switched to applicable period A Rider PPO - MI on the June 2000 billing period.	Total Savings or (Loss) if the Account remained on Rider PPO NFF and switched to period B Rider PPO - MI on the January 2001 billing period.
50797003	AMERITECH #6547	10 SCOTT ST	ELK GROVE VIL	\$ 10,188	\$ 15,230
203268008	AMERITECH Q62440 RCC=QVA6800	1866 2ND ST	HIGHLAND PARK	\$ (1,343)	\$ 1,054
213520006	AMERITECH #6113989	50 E DUNDEE RD	WHEELING	\$ (13,781)	\$ (1,538)
213760000	AMERITECH Q25710 RCC=QVA6800	700 MALL DR	SCHAUMBURG	\$ 7,486	\$ 5,861
275029000	AMERITECH #6545	106 EASTMAN	ARLINGTON HEIGHTS	\$ 23,381	\$ 18,802
277738002	AMERITECH Q67280 RCC=QVA6800	34 N HILLSIDE AVE	HILLSIDE	\$ 4,261	\$ 3,786
284311002	AMERITECH Q65170	2305 SANDERS ROAD	NORTHFIELD TWP	\$ 77,047	\$ 72,241
297661002	AMERITECH Q25170 RCC=QVA6800	1020 E NEW YORK ST	AURORA	\$ 7,542	\$ 6,086
300766009	AMERITECH Q25270 RCC=QVA6800	10 E IRVING PARK RD	ROSELLE	\$ 5,803	\$ 7,438
354524002	AMERITECH	2777 PRATUM AVE	HOFFMAN ESTATES	\$ 2,177	\$ 2,194
356536000	AMERITECH Q26750 RCC=QVA6800	25W225 RIDGELAND RD	LISLE TWP	\$ 3,059	\$ 3,447
371289002	AMERITECH UT #8128852	6125 W 26TH ST	CICERO	\$ (4,683)	\$ 4,896
429210006	AMERITECH #2561 Q25610 RCC=Q	1325 JONES RD	HOFFMAN ESTATES	\$ 22,028	\$ 16,148
447583002	AMERITECH Q25450 RCC=QVA6800	20 N MAIN ST	LOMBARD	\$ 14,541	\$ 14,133
447649005	AMERITECH Q25100 RCC=QVA6800	444 PENNSYLVANIA AVE	GLEN ELLYN	\$ 3,936	\$ 3,553
457757005	AMERITECH Q25520 RCC=QVA6800	WS OF MEACHAM-IN OF	SCHAUMBURG	\$ 1,749	\$ 1,513
531785001	AMERITECH Q71030 RCC=QVA6800	262 N OTTAWA ST	JOLIET	\$ (2,658)	\$ (1,965)
549492006	AMERITECH Q13230 RCC=QVA6800	8858 S MARQUETTE AVE	CHICAGO	\$ (16,675)	\$ (6,166)
553317007	AMERITECH Q21370 RCC=QVA6800	7831 W 175TH ST	TINLEY PARK	\$ 146	\$ (85)
614584002	AMERITECH CO	475 E OAK ST	KANKAKEE	\$ (5,682)	\$ (4,289)
615699002	AMERITECH Q24140 RCC=QVA6800	20 S ORCHARD DR	PARK FOREST	\$ 6,173	\$ 4,832
623670002	AMERITECH Q27520 RCCQVA68000	225 MAIN ST	WEST CHICAGO	\$ 3,374	\$ 2,790
642273005	AMERITECH Q11280 RCC=QVA6800	6001 N NORTHWEST HWY	CHICAGO	\$ 15,328	\$ 12,771
697365003	AMERITECH Q11740 RCC=QVA6800	5604 W BELDEN ST	CHICAGO	\$ (7,507)	\$ 405
697562002	AMERITECH Q13470 RCC=QVA6800	6247 S KILBOURN AVE	CHICAGO	\$ (9,383)	\$ (2,470)
724328009	AMERITECH Q13550 RCC=QVA6800	65 W 113TH PL	CHICAGO	\$ 11,473	\$ 8,031
765175004	AMERITECH Q67170 RCCQVA68000	152 S YORK ST	ELMHURST	\$ (3,388)	\$ 101
793747001	AMERITECH Q27400 RCC=QVA6800	200 MAIN ST	BARTLETT	\$ (8,138)	\$ (3,272)
793775005	AMERITECH	120 S LINCOLN ST	HINSDALE	\$ (26,363)	\$ (4,507)
879581003	AMERITECH Q71310 RCC=QVA6800	627 W LOCKPORT RD	PLAINFIELD	\$ 3,785	\$ 3,861
933377005	AMERITECH Q24220 RCC=QVA6800	18214 DIXIE HWY	HOMEWOOD	\$ 4,149	\$ 4,274
935311005	AMERITECH Q12950 RCC=QVA6800	641 N DEARBORN ST	CHICAGO	\$ 19,317	\$ 17,478
935412007	AMERITECH Q13390 RCC=QVA6800	2240-44 W 37TH ST	CHICAGO	\$ 12,670	\$ 4,447
942194005	AMERITECH Q24170 RCC=QVA6800	1401 DEER CREEK LN	FORD HEIGHTS	\$ 2,457	\$ 2,069
972380000	AMERITECH	1620 W 99TH ST	CHICAGO	\$ (13,200)	\$ 1,507
1017652006	AMERITECH	1908 S SAINT LOUIS AVE	CHICAGO	\$ (3,854)	\$ (1,087)
1094191000	AMERITECH Q67100 RCC=QVA6800	7 W GREEN ST	BENSENVILLE	\$ (18,322)	\$ (6,364)
1106383001	AMERITECH Q26200 RCC=QVA6800	DOWNERS GROVE	DOWNERS GROVE	\$ 18,729	\$ 15,177
1199622002	AMERITECH Q11410 RCC=QVA6800	2940 W CORTLAND ST	CHICAGO	\$ 12,504	\$ 7,834
1274575004	AMERITECH Q71660 RCC=QVA6800	205 S CEDAR RD	NEW LENOX	\$ (448)	\$ 558
1297586005	AMERITECH Q21390 RCC=QVA6800	7900 W 95TH ST	HICKORY HILLS	\$ 3,984	\$ 3,300
1430149000	AMERITECH Q12990 RCC=QVA6800	200 E RANDOLPH ST LOWR LLIA	CHICAGO	\$ 18,930	\$ 9,026
1430386003	AMERITECH Q12830 RCC=QVA6800	2211 S WABASH AVE	CHICAGO	\$ (17,481)	\$ (5,199)
1633113006	AMERITECH Q11930 RCC=QVA6800	3950 N SAWYER AVE	CHICAGO	\$ (18,190)	\$ (6,917)
1633135002	AMERITECH Q11240 RCC=QVA6800	3949 N LECLAIRE AVE	CHICAGO	\$ (15,574)	\$ (2,321)
1633171008	AMERITECH Q13830 RCC=QVA6800	233 W 76TH ST	CHICAGO	\$ 28,345	\$ 21,778
3410547002	AMERITECH Q73340 RCC=QVA6800	1311 COURT ST	MCHENRY	\$ (4,164)	\$ (821)
3455002000	AMERITECH CO	222 W JACKSON ST	WOODSTOCK	\$ (1,059)	\$ (235)
8342417009	AMERITECH Q13410 RCC=QVA6800	2330 W 63RD ST	CHICAGO	\$ (18,860)	\$ 2,480
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$ 133,808</b>	<b>\$ 251,867</b>

\*\*Methodology, including assumptions, detailed in Exhibit 3